

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
9 **FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
10

11 KENNETH E. ALSPAUGH,

12 Petitioner,

13 v.

14 SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, et  
15 al.,

16 Respondents.  
17

No. 2:22-CV-0761-DMC

ORDER

18 Petitioner, who is proceeding pro se, brings this petition for a writ of habeas  
19 corpus. Pending before the Court is Petitioner's petition, ECF No. 1. "A petitioner for habeas  
20 corpus relief must name the state officer having custody of him or her as the respondent to the  
21 petition." Stanley v. California Supreme Court, 21 F.3d 359, 360 (9th Cir. 1994); see also Rule  
22 2(a), Federal Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. Because Petitioner has not named the  
23 appropriate state officer, Petitioner will be provided leave to amend to correct this technical  
24 defect by naming the correct respondent. See Stanley, 21 F.3d at 360. Petitioner is warned that  
25 failure to comply with this order may result in the dismissal of this action. See Local Rule 110.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Petitioner's petition for writ of habeas corpus, ECF No. 1, is dismissed with leave to amend;

2. Petitioner shall file an amended petition on the form employed by this court, and which names the proper respondent and states all claims and requests for relief, within 30 days of the date of this order; and

3. The Clerk of the Court is directed to send Petitioner the Court's form habeas corpus application.

Dated: September 14, 2022



DENNIS M. COTA  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE